UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,394	12/27/2001	Bryan Jeffery Moles	SAMS01-00175	1196

			EXAMINER
7590	07/26/2005		PITARO, RYAN F

Docket Clerk
P.O. Drawer 800889
. Dallas, TX 75380

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 June 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-21 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2.   This action is in response to the communication filed 6/13/2005. Claims 1-21

have been amended. Claims 1, 8, 15 are independent. This Action is Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bickmore et al ("Bickmore", Web-Page Filtering and Re-Authoring Mobile Users) in view

of Patil et al ("Patil", US 6,489,976).

As per independent claim 1, Bickmore discloses a converter for automatically

adapting markup language documents for display in small areas comprising: a

conversion controller scanning a portion of markup language source selected for display

for tags associated with graphical elements and replacing each detected graphical

element (Column 4 lines 60-63, Column 5 lines 1-2) within the selected markup

language source portion with one of a plurality of placeholders (Column 11 lines 23-26).

Bickmore fails to distinctly point out reusable placeholders having labels corresponding

to buttons. However, Patil teaches having labels corresponding to a set of buttons (Column 4 lines 36-40), wherein the plurality of placeholders are reused to replace detected graphical elements within other portions of the markup language source when such other portions are selected for display (Column 5 lines 21-31). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine method of Bickmore with the current teaching of Patil. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a convenient way of initiating a link besides the conventional point and click method.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Bickmore fails to distinctly point out a physical switch for user control. However, Patil teaches wherein each button is a physical switch or display element functioning as a user control for initiating display of a graphical element replaced by a corresponding placeholder (Column 6 lines 17-25, Column 36-39). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine method of Bickmore with the current teaching of Patil. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a convenient way of initiating a link besides the conventional point and click method.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 3, Bickmore-Patil discloses a converter wherein the graphical elements replaced by one of the placeholders includes images, user controls, hyperlinks, tables, and animations (Bickmore, Column 11 lines 23-26).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 4, Bickmore-Patil discloses a converter wherein the conversion controller, responsive to selection of the markup

language source portion for display, automatically replaces a tag associated with each

detected graphical element with a link to one of the placeholders (Bickmore, Column 11

lines 23-26).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Bickmore-Patil teaches a

conversion controller, responsive to election of a different portion of the markup

language source for display including a different set of graphical elements than the

previously selected markup language portion (Patil, Column 5 lines 21-23),

automatically replaces a tag associated with each detected graphical element within the

different markup language source portion with a link to one of the placeholders

(Bickmore, Column 11 lines 23-26), thereby reusing placeholders for the different set of

graphical elements (Patil, Column 5 lines 26-31; *order of presentation changed as order

and content of icons change*).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 4, Bickmore-Patil discloses a

converter wherein the conversion controller passes altered markup language source

containing at least one link to one of the placeholders in place of a graphical element

within the selected markup language source portion to a markup language interpreter

for rendering and display (Bickmore, Column 11 lines 23-35).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Bickmore-Patil discloses a

converter wherein the actuation of a button corresponding to a placeholder within a

displayed portion of the altered markup language source initiates display of the

graphical element replaced be the corresponding placeholder (Patil, Column 6 lines 17-

25, Column 6 lines 36-39).

Page 5

Claims 8,15 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 9,16 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 10,17 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11,18 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 12,19 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13,20 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 14,21 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of.the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US006857102B1 teaches re-authoring a document for a small screen.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-

4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through

Thursday, and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

KRISTINE KINCAID
PERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
.OGY CENTER 2100